## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America,	)	CRIMINAL NO. 3:08-4-CMC
v.	)	OPINION and ORDER
Cynthia Lemon,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion, filed February 3, 2011, seeking reconsideration of the sentence imposed by this court on September 4, 2008. *See* Dkt. # 93. This motion is repetitive of three previous motions filed by Defendant. *See* Dkt. Nos. 78, 84, 90.

Rule 35(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure permits a court to "correct a sentence that resulted from arithmetical, technical, or other clear error" within seven days after the oral announcement of the sentence. See Rules 35(a) and (c), Fed.R.Crim.P. The sentence was orally announced on September 4, 2008, and, accordingly, the deadline for any action by the court on a Rule 35(a) motion is well past. Therefore, the court is without jurisdiction to act upon Defendant's motion in this regard.

Apart from Rule 35(a), a district court has no jurisdiction to alter a defendant's term of imprisonment except as authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3582 or 18 U.S.C. § 3742.

Title 18 United States Code § 3582(c) limits the court's authority to modify a final judgment that includes a sentence of imprisonment to three specific circumstances. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) (the court can modify a judgment (1) upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP")

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In 2010, this Rule was changed to allow fourteen (14) days for such correction. However, the Rule in effect at the time of Defendant's sentencing provided only seven (7) days.

for statutorily-specified reasons, (2) upon motion of the government for substantial assistance, or (3) upon motion of the defendant or the BOP, or upon the court's own motion, because of a subsequent lowering of the applicable sentencing range.). None of these circumstances applies to Defendant.

After an appeal, the court can modify a sentence if the sentence is found by the appellate court to have been imposed in violation of law or imposed as a result of an incorrect application of the sentencing guidelines, as provided for in 18 U.S.C. § 3742. Defendant did not appeal her conviction or sentence.

Defendant's motion does not allege that any of these circumstances applies; rather, Defendant seeks to revisit issues addressed at sentencing. The court lacks jurisdiction to modify Defendant's sentence.<sup>2</sup>

Defendant's motion is denied for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina February 8, 2011

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>It was within the court's discretion to run the sentence imposed September 4, 2008, "concurrently, partially concurrently, or consecutively to the prior undischarged term of imprisonment..." U.S.S.G. § 5G1.3(c). The court ran Defendant's sentence consecutively to the undischarged term of her state sentence, and specified the reasons for doing so on the record at sentencing.